

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/072,543

Applicant(s)

MORTON ET AL.

Examiner

Max Hindenburg

Art Unit

3736

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Max Hindenburg.

(3) Bryan Wahl.

(2) Gerald Von Hoffman.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-36.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kushnir.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives discussed how Kushnir did not meet the claims in that there was no disclosure of use for nipple aspirate or circumferential compression of the breast and Kushnir did not really teach bladders or their dimensions. The examiner indicated adding circumferential to the claims would help overcome the art and that Kushnir did teach bladders as set forth in the previous rejection, but may not teach their dimensions as claimed. The examiner indicated an action on the merits would wait for a preliminary amendment to be sent and it would be discussed with Mr. Foreman before Mr. Foreman acted on the merits.